

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of June 14, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 16, 18-23, and 27-29 have been amended, claims 2, 7, 11, and 17 have been cancelled, and claims 30-33 have been added. Applicants submit that these new claims are fully supported by the specification, and thus introduce no new matter to the application. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-16, and 18-33 are pending in this application.

Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, Applicants note with appreciation the courtesies extended by Examiner Nguyen and Examiner Bayshore to the undersigned and Mr. Brisnehan during the interview of August 8, 2006. At least some of the comments below encompass the totality of the issues discussed during the interview, and, as such, provide the substance of the interview in accord with MPEP § 713.04.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Claims 1, 5-10, 13-16, and 19-28**

Claims 1, 5-10, 13-16, and 19-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,636 to Levine et al. (*Levine*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,146,552 to Cassorla et al. (*Cassorla*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites, in part, “storing annotation stroke data based on the received annotation stroke input ... wherein the annotation stroke data is stored in an annotation file associated with the user.” Support for this recitation can be found, e.g., at page 5, line 25 through page 6, line 2 of the specification as originally filed. *Levine* relates to annotating an electronic document, but neither the cited sections of *Levine*, nor any other portion that Applicants have identified, discloses annotation files which are specific to a user. Thus, *Levine* does not teach or suggest storing annotations “in an annotation file associated with the user,” as recited in amended claim 1. *Cassorla* discloses text-based annotations that may be made by multiple users, but also does not teach or suggest an “annotation file associated with the user,” as recited in claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 3-6, 8-9, 21-23,

and 30-33 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as based on additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite a system for annotating electronic documents comprising computer software to perform steps similar to those recited in claims 1. Accordingly, claim 10, and dependent claims 12-15 and 24-26 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite a computer-readable storage medium comprising computer-executable instructions for performing steps similar to those recited in claims 1. Accordingly, claim 16, and dependent claims 18-20 and 27-28 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 29 has been similarly amended to recite, in part, “storing the annotation as a stroke in a data structure in an annotation file associated with the user, the annotation file stored separate from the electronic document.” Accordingly, claim 29 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Claims 2-4, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 29

Claims 2-4, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over the combination of *Levine* in view of *Cassorla*, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,320,577 to Alexander (*Alexander*). Although *Alexander* relates to electronic annotations, Applicants note that *Alexander* also does not disclose or suggest “storing annotation stroke data based on the received annotation stroke input ... wherein the annotation stroke data is stored in an annotation file associated with the user,” as recited in claim 1. Thus, *Alexander* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Levine* and *Cassorla* discussed above, and for the same reasons stated above, claims 2-4, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 29 are allowable over the combination of *Levine*, *Cassorla*, and *Alexander*.

#### *New Claims*

Applicants have added new claims 30-33 to more fully claim their invention. Claims 30-33 depend from independent claim 1, and are thus allowable over the cited references for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as based on additional features recited therein.

Additionally, claim 30 recites, in part, “wherein said annotation file contains a user identifier associated with the user.” Claim 31 recites, in part, “wherein access permissions on the annotation file are set to allow the user access to the annotations while denying access to certain other users.” As described above in regards to claim 1, neither *Levine* nor *Cassorla* discloses associating an annotation file with the user. Furthermore, no portion of *Levine* or *Cassorla* that Applicants have identified discloses an “annotation file contain[ing] a user identifier,” as recited in claim 30, or setting “access permissions on the annotation file … to allow the user access to the annotations while denying access to certain other users,” as recited in claim 31. Thus, for these additional reasons, claims 30 and 31 are allowable over the cited references.

Additionally, claim 32 recites, in part, “wherein blending the pixels comprises execution of an alpha blending function.” The office action relies on *Alexander*, col. 23, lines 5-12, as disclosing blending pixels. However, neither the cited portion of *Alexander*, nor any other portion that Applicants have identified, discloses blending the pixels of the annotation with the pixels from the currently displayed document in “an alpha blending function,” as recited in new claim 32. Thus, for this additional reason, claim 32 is allowable over the cited references.

### CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3223.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 23rd day of August, 2006

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Reg. No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597